Safety Review Committee
July 16, 2004
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Members Present
Joel Ager , Michael Banda, John Bercovitz, Dennis Collins, Sharon Doyle, Ben Feinberg (Chair), Kenneth Fletcher, Richard Kadel, Mack Kennedy, Peter Lichty, Don Lucas, Augusto Macchiavelli, Linfeng Rao, Peter Seidl, Weyland Wong, Linda Wuy,
Members Absent
Linda Smith, Scott Taylor, Hisao Yokota
Others Present
John Chernowski, Kem Robinson, John Seabury, Pat Thomas (Secretary), Robin Wendt

Minutes of May Meeting

It was moved, seconded, and carried to accept the May minutes as submitted.

Comments from the Chair

New SRC Members: AFRD representative Peter Seidl , Mechanical Safety Subcommittee chair John Bercovitz, and SRC Secretary Pat Thomas were introduced.

Engineering Division MESH

Kem Robinson, Director of the Engineering Division, responded to the Management of Environment, Safety, and Health (MESH) review committee report. The review was led by Ken Fletcher. The other reviewers were Ben Feinberg and Linda Wuy. Otis Wong provided support from the Office of Assessment and Assurance. Ken Fletcher and Kem Robinson thanked Weyland Wong, Engineering Division ES&H Coordinator, for his assistance.

The Engineering Division has been undergoing a period of change with a new director, reorganization, and reduction in force. A task force was formed in May 2003 to focus on the fundamental direction of the division. Engineering wants to focus on teaming and partnering with the scientific divisions. The new organization structure has 3 major departments: Electronics and Software, Mechanical and Fabrication, and Operations. The purpose of the organization is to establish direct line management responsibility and avoid "stovepiping".

Insufficient funding and program/project demand resulted in a funding shortfall, necessitating a 20% reduction in force. Critical skills were maintained to reduce institutional impact. The largest source of funds ($30 million) is divisions using engineering services. The engineering workforce is now the right size, and they are looking forward to a period of greater stability. Increased ES&H expectations from the DOE Office of Science are a challenge. The engineering workforce includes leaders, core career professionals, term employees for particular projects, and temporary/tactical specialists hired under contracts. Communicating the safety culture and expectations to contract workers is another important challenge.

The Division has reduced the number of recordable and first aid accident cases over the last four years. Complacency and waiting too long to report discomfort are factors that have contributed to accidents. Three recordable cases were discussed:

1. A worker pressed too hard on a wrench while tightening a vacuum flange, resulting in a bruise to the hand. In response, wrenches have been adapted to spread weight, and workers are being encouraged to stop and think at the point of discomfort, before injury occurs.
2. A worker was typing with wrists bent, resulting in an ergonomic injury. Ergonomics evaluations are being increased to prevent injuries.
3. A worker was reading while walking, and stepped off a curb.

There were no discernable trends in the types or timing of accidents. Engineering Division is working to increase understanding of safety. For example, Guy Pulsifer is conducting weekly shop safety meetings. The message is: if a task is not safe, it is not worth doing. Morale is improving. The OSHA audit activities increased safety awareness. The workload is lighter than it was in past years, so this the right time to work on establishing good habits.

To reinforce direct line management responsibility and accountability, Engineering decided not to have a safety committee. Kem believes line management can best integrate all work objectives. He holds employees responsible for knowing the hazards and safety precautions applicable to their work. Technicians are involved in assessing their work areas. Many employees are matrixed, so there are different safety concerns in different areas. Supervisors are expected to understand their employees' activities. The effectiveness of this approach will be monitored.

Noteworthy practices include regular safety discussions with supervisors, and a knowledgeable and assertive Safety Coordinator who investigates accidents. Accident investigations focus on causes, not blame, and there are no adverse consequences for reporting accidents. The accident review board was disbanded because employees felt uncomfortable about talking to the group. The most disturbing accident was an electric shock from a miswired cart that was used for moving equipment. It indicated a problem with work quality assurance.

Engineering is working with TEID to improve their safety website. A concern was raised by SRC members that the cost of web hosting may discourage posting of safety information.

They are also developing MOUs for matrixed personnel, in accordance with RPM section 701. These are expected to be in place within 1 year.

Expired and inactive work authorizations for the SNS and klystron in Bldg. 71 should be assigned to AFRD line management if they are ever reactivated. The SNS has been disassembled and shipped to Oak Ridge, and the klystron power has been locked off.

Routine work is documented on the HEAR database. John Seabury is working on clarifications to the line management authorization process in Chapter 6 of PUB-3000. The SRC members would like to have a general discussion of line management work authorization requirements at a future meeting.

People from other divisions who use Engineering shops are expected to follow Engineering Division rules. There is a need to improve communication of safety concerns in shared workspaces. Concerns can be documented through LCATS, or the safety suggestion box on the EH&S website.

Kem wants to do more walkthroughs and improve guidance and documentation for line management walkthroughs.

The next step will be to defend the Engineering Division ISM Plan before the ISM Review Board.

Laser Safety Subcommittee

Don Lucas reported on the activities of the Laser Safety Subcommittee. Members of the committee include:. Donald Lucas, Joel Ager, Marcus Hertlein, Richard Kadel; Gary Zeeman, Ted de Castro, Muriel James (EH&S); Ken Barat (LLNL) and Eddie Ciprazo (UCB). They have good meetings with full participation. Their activities include:

- Ensuring review recommendations are completed;
- Reviewing the OSHA findings;
- Improving standards for door interlock and crash-off systems;
- Looking at eyewear storage locations.

LBNL generally follows the ANSI laser standards; however, we need to improve documentation of when and why we decide to "opt out" of particular requirements. Ken Barat is on the ANSI standards committee and can provide clarifications.

Laser AHDs will now require Laser Safety Officer approval. AHD templates are being improved. They want to improve the process for coordinating AHD reviews.

The laser safety retraining requirement wasn't being displayed on the EH&S Training database. The on-line LLNL laser course can be used to meet retraining requirements. This resource needs to be accessible from the LBNL website. (Plans to improve and integrate the EH&S databases will be discussed at the September SRC meeting.)

The SRC may ask the subcommittee to comment on the adequacy of EH&S resources for laser safety.

Los Alamos experienced a serious laser accident involving a student. Our Laser Safety Subcommittee may be asked to assist in the investigation.

ISM Board Process

Robin Wendt described the ISM Review Board process. The Board consists of the two deputy laboratory directors and the EH&S Division director. After each MESH review, the Division Director is asked to present and defend their ISM Plan before the Board. Self-Assessment criteria performance, accident history, and MESH findings are reviewed. The review provides an opportunity for a focused discussion of the division's safety program. The Board

recommends the interval (2-4 years) before the next MESH review. The next Advanced Light Source (ALS) MESH review will be held in 3 years.

Safety Magazine

Robin Wendt has been making arrangements to have a quarterly, seasonal safety magazine sent to employees' homes. It is prepared by the National Safety Council. SRC members liked the idea, and suggested that the magazine include an LBNL logo on the cover, but no additional slogan or ISM logo. "Today at Berkeley Lab" articles can be used to reinforce the safety messages.

Mechanical Safety Subcommittee

John Bercovitz reported on the activities of the Mechanical Safety Subcommittee. The other members are: Michael Dong (ventilation), Yoichi Kajiyama (ASME Code pressure vessels), Mike Kritscher (non-code vessels), and Derek Shuman (high value/high consequence lifting). Fred Angliss reviews seismic safety issues.

They review, and sometimes write, safety notes. They also review PUB-3000 requirements. Engineering Safety Notes are stored in the Engineering Document Library and stickers are placed on equipment. They are getting more requests for formal lift reviews.

John Seabury is trying to make arrangements with LLNL to provide a pressure certification class for engineers and technicians.

Security Issue

UC Berkeley students can board the LBNL bus using their student ID cards. The system doesn't seem to be causing problems now, but it does raise some concerns about security and safety. SRC members requested a discussion with Dan Lunsford at a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Thomas
SRC Secretary